

Application No. 10/614,217
Amendment dated March 16, 2005
Reply to Office Action of November 29, 2004

Atty. Docket No. 2855/97

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-17 are pending in the application. Reconsideration in view the following remarks is respectfully requested. Claims 1-4 and 7-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Pendray et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,,678,119). Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pendray et al. Claims 1 is amended for clarification purposes. Claim 9 is amended to correct minor clerical errors. New claims 18-25 are added.

Applicant respectfully submits that nowhere does the Pendray reference teach, suggest or disclose “[a] subambient pressure air bearing slider comprising:... at least one side air bearing surface, wherein a placement of said side air bearing surface and a width of said side air bearing surface in the longitudinal direction of the slider are selected to achieve a predetermined flying height sensitivity to crowning in the slider” (e.g., as described in the embodiment of amended claim 9).

The Office Action alleges that Pendray describes a subambient pressure air bearing slider... wherein a placement of the side air bearing surface and a width of the side air bearing surface in the longitudinal direction of the slider are selected to achieve a predetermined flying height sensitivity to crowning in the slider”, but does not cite to a specific section in Pendray that does so. Moreover, the Office Action cites column 3 lines 61-67 a method wherein said selecting operation further comprises selecting a width, in the longitudinal direction for the slider body, of a trailing air bearing surface to achieve said predetermined flying height sensitivity to crowning in the slider. Column 3 lines 61-67 state:

As discussed in more detail below, slider 110 has a hydrodynamic (e.g. air) bearing that has a reduced fly height sensitivity to changes in ambient pressure at altitudes between sea level and 10,000 feet above sea level. This allows the target fly height to be

Application No. 10/614,217
Amendment dated March 16, 2005
Reply to Office Action of November 29, 2004

Atty. Docket No. 2855/97

set more efficiently for flying conditions at sea level, and also reduces the possibility of head crashes at high operating altitudes.

Applicants respectfully submit that this section does not teach, suggest or disclose at least the limitations "...at least one side air bearing surface, wherein a placement of said side air bearing surface and a width of said side air bearing surface in the longitudinal direction of the slider are selected to achieve a predetermined flying height sensitivity to crowning in the slider" as found in the embodiment of claim 9. Claim 12 contains similar allowable limitations.

Similarly, Applicant respectfully submits that the Pendray reference does not teach suggest or disclose "[a] subambient pressure air bearing slider comprising...a subambient pressure region extending between the leading portion and between first and second low-profile members, said low-profile members having a height that is less than the height of said leading air bearing surface wherein a width of said side air bearing surface in a latitudinal direction of the slider is selected to achieve a predetermined flying height sensitivity to camber in the slider" (e.g., as described in the embodiment of claim 1). The Office Action does not cite to any specific section in Pendray when addressing previous claims 10 and 14, rather forwarding an unsupported assertion. Applicant respectfully submits that this is inadequate to support a 35 U.S.C. 102(e) rejection.

Therefore, since each and every limitation is not taught or suggested in the Pendray reference, independent claims 1, 9 and 12 are in condition for allowance and the 35 U.S.C. 102(e) rejection should be withdrawn. Claims 2-8, 10-11 and 13-25 depend from allowable independent claims and therefore are allowable. For the foregoing reasons, the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejections should be withdrawn as well.

Application No. 10/614,217
Amendment dated March 16, 2005
Reply to Office Action of November 29, 2004

Atty. Docket No. 2855/97

For at least all the above reasons, the Applicant respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (408) 975-7500 to discuss any matter concerning this application. The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17 to Deposit Account No. 11-0600.

Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON

Dated: March 16, 2005By: 

Sumit Bhattacharya
(Reg. No. 51,469)

KENYON & KENYON
333 West San Carlos St., Suite 600
San Jose, CA 95110

Direct Line: (408) 975-7950
Facsimile: (408) 975-7501